

REMARKS

UPON A

PAMPHLET,

INTIT'L'D,

*A REVIEW of the Controversy
about the Meaning of De-
moniacs, &c.*

WHEREIN

The SERMON,

Which asserteth the usual interpretation, &c.
is vindicated from every exception of the
REVIEWER,

BY

THOMAS HUTCHINSON, D.D.

Of Hart-Hall in Oxford,

and PREBENDARY of *Chichester.*

LONDON,

Printed for W. INNYS and R. MANBY at the
West End of St. Paul's. MDCCXXXIX.

REMARKS

P. A. M. R. H. E. T.

MR. R. E. W. of the University
of the City of London
London, 1800.

The SERMON

Preached at the University of London
on the 10th of May 1800.

THOMAS HUTCHINSON, D.D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

and FELLOW OF THE SOCIETY OF THE APOSTLES

Printed for W. & A. G. Smith, at the
New End of the Strand, 1800.

P R E F A C E.

IN these Remarks the author of the Review is patiently follow'd thro' every sentence of his work, which relateth to the Sermon. And, shou'd there sometimes appear a jejunenefs in the progress, the considerate reader will be pleas'd to impute the fault to the nature of the Review. The Remarks descend to a minute examination of it, (not because it deserv'd such attention, but) lest the author might fancy, that the unanswer'd parts were really unanswerable. And, even whilst the weakness of certain writers is expos'd, they will be reveng'd, in some measure, on each adversary, by infusing into his compositions a tincture of their own futility.

But, the excellencies of our author's performance must not be dissembled. The judgment, then, which is display'd in the conduct of it, is confessed abundantly sufficient to surprize; and the urbanity, wherewith it is season'd, equally qualify'th it to divert. Thro'out the whole are diffus'd undoubted evidences of a singular love of truth: and, in discussing the references, the author bath uniformly

maintain'd a considerable figure, by prudently substituting a part for the whole.

The author seemeth to lay much stress on the authority of Mr. Mede — Is he, on other occasions, usually dispos'd to pay deference to authority? And, can he be ignorant, that the authority of many, equal at least, if not superior, to Mr. Mede, in learning and judgment, might be produc'd against his opinion?

Several famous men, 'tis true, besides the learned Mr. Mede, have advanc'd the same opinion. And, about the close of the Sermon, it is say'd — “ If he (the author of the Enquiry, &c.) did not know, that Pomponatius, Vaninus, Hobbs, Spinoza and Bekker especially, had all patronis'd the same opinion; he may, perhaps, when he cometh to this knowledg, congratulate himself upon the lucky coincidence of his own thoughts with the thoughts of men, distinguish'd by singular penetration. If he was not a stranger to their concurrence, their characters might have justify'd a suspicion, at least, of the doctrin, and occasion'd a more accurate inquiry into the foundation of it, before it was espous'd and publickly reviv'd.”

With this reflexion the Reviewer is incens'd: and immediately recurring (agreeably to the suggestions of nature, in cases of distress) to his chief instrument of defence, he cryeth out — “ It was impertinent to talk in that manner in a Pulpit — ” It still seemeth very per-

P R E F A C E. v

inent to point out the persons, who join'd this with their other abuses of holy Scripture; and, from violating it's language, made an easy transition to the elusion of it's authority. The young are hereby taught the fatal restlessness of error, and the danger of assenting to such comments, in regard to one point, as tend to spread ambiguity thro'out the whole sacred Text.

We are not, indeed, assur'd that, in any future inquiries, the same violent method of interpretation will be apply'd to the great mysteries of our faith. Yet, how well our Author is prepar'd to use it, at least, in perverting some important instructions, that occur in holy Scripture¹, may be easily collected from his harangue² against the persuasion, that "poor Men (so pitifully do'th he talk) may "be artfully seduc'd from the Ways of Vir-
"tue and Religion by invisible, spiritual
"Enemies."

Shou'd any readers be hereupon dispos'd to ask — To what purpose, then, have St. Paul, St. James and St. Peter deliver'd the directions, which are extant in the places referr'd to? — our author can furnish them with an easy solution, in his way, by acquainting them, that tho' διαβολα, in a certain book, is vulgarly suppos'd to denote an evil, spiritual, deluding, powerful Being; yet, in other good writings, (to him well known) the word can

¹ See Eph. iv. 27. vi. 11. James iv. 7. 1 Pet. v. 8.

² Review, p. 26, 27.

only signify, in the utmost extent of it's power, a sly, gloomy, intriguing, malicious accuser of his brethren. Thus will it plainly enough appear, that those apostles may be fairly understood only to have given cautions against dark, designing fellows, — such as, in their times, infested the Christian church; and such, as it is thought not to be intirely free from, in the present.

Our author (in the common strain of anti-scripturists) ¹ talks of “ridiculous notions, blended with the true religion”; or such, as may provoke ² “high ridicule.” This same tremendous argument — “high ridicule” — was in great vogue amongst some antient unbelievers: and the exquisite subtlety, which it sheweth, in conjunction with its astonishing strength, must be suppos'd to have recommended it to the use of their judicious successors, in the laudable work of torturing and deriding the Scriptures. Nevertheless, each reviver of this old device may be contented with an old admonition (which the Reviewer is left to find, without a reference) *Επίχαρις — παρὰ τὴν ἀποπείη γέλωτα.*

But, our author seemeth to give kind notice ³, that dangerous attacks may be expected from unbelievers, “who have Eyes (as he sagaciously observeth) to see our Weakness, “and Hands ready to expose us.” How weak

¹ Review, p. 4.

² A sort of cant-phrase in the Enquiry and Review.

³ Review, p. 4.

he and his friends are, and how liable to be expos'd, it became him to consider, before he undertook the office of a Reviewer. But, cou'd he prevail with the infidels (whose dreadful, well-known eyes and hands seem to have made a deep impresson upon him) to imploy their eyes in reading proper books, they can never, consistently with any degree of modesty, imploy their hands in committing to paper such crude, profane reveries, as they have been long accusom'd to obtrude upon the publick. How they are encourag'd to repeat their abuses of the press, it may be difficult to say; unless the irreligious tenor of their productions may, amongst their acquaintance, be thought sufficient attonement for their dulness; and give them an air of significancy, whilst it ingageth some to read, and some moreover to refute them — such to read them with delight, as contemn Revelation — and such to refute them, as regard that contempt with just concern.

In the course of the Remarks, the Inquirer and the Reviewer have been consider'd, as the same individual. Shou'd there be a mistake herein, and shou'd each be to the other only another learned and ingenious self, the mistake will be acknowledg'd, whenever the one shall think fit to step out of the crowd of Philaleths, and the other favour us with more clear discoveries of himself, than can be collected from the numerous, ambiguous marks of his extraordinary merit.

be and his friends are, and how liable to be exposed, it became him to consider, before he undertook the office of a Reviewer. But, could he prevail with the infidels (whose dreadful well-battered eyes and hands seem to have made a deep impression upon him) to supply their eyes in reading proper books, they can never confound with any degree of modern fancy, their habits in committing to paper false words, profane conceits, as they have been long accustomed to obtain a view of the public. How

ERRATA.

P. 25. l. 10. for *ἄλλων* r. *ἁλλων*.

30. l. 23. after *Men*, add, *more unworthy of Christians*.

REMARKS

UPON A

PAMPHLET,

INTIT'L'D,

*A REVIEW of the Controversy
about the Meaning of De-
moniacs, &c.*

THE examination of the Sermon, which asserteth the *usual interpretation*, &c. is thus introduc'd —
“ The difference betwixt Mr. *Hutchinson* and the *Enquirer* would soon be at an End, had he produc'd Authorities *an-*
“ *tienter* than the New Testament for the Use
“ of the Word *δαίμων* in the Sense he under-
“ stands it.” Here the author discovereth a

! Review, p 16.

B

fymptom,

symptom, that may seem hopeful enough, at the first view. But it, alas! (like the language, which his demoniacs will sometimes utter) taketh a sudden and unpromising change. For, thus he immediately proceeds—

“ But with all the Pomp of References that
 “ his Margins are stuff’d with, there is not so
 “ much as one that is as antient as the New
 “ Testament, that is to his purpose.”¹ Who
 wou’d not be pleas’d even with the severity of
 a sentence, that is pronounc’d with such de-
 cency and elegance? Yet, what expostulations
 might have been expected from this delicate
 writer, had those offensive margins appear’d
 without references?

It cannot be suppos’d, indeed, that the method of directing the reader to authorities, which I have chosen to use, shou’d be approv’d by any modern dealers in antiscriptural cavils. These are generally contented with repeating such citations, as they find already made; and, if they produce the name only of an author, their intimate acquaintance with him must, in compliance with their modest expectations, be acknowledged. Writers, less adventurous, will not refuse the Public even the lower instances of their diligence. And, in treating subjects, where authorities are requir’d, those may seem to consult their own reputation, as well as their reader’s convenience, most successfully, who draw off the sentiments of the authors cited, with fidelity;

¹ Review, *ibid.*

represent them digested and connected, with propriety and perspicuity; and then refer, with accuracy, to the places, wherein they occur. Recourse to the several originals is hereby facilitated; suspicions of unfair practice prevented; or, at least, the more curious reader is enabled, without loss of time, to remove the suspicions, which he may have conceiv'd.

This digression may, perhaps, be wonder'd at— It is chiefly made for the sake of the *Reviewer*; that he may hereafter learn to distinguish between pomp and propriety.

II.

What? shall our *judg of pertinence and good writing* acknowledg the propriety of references, “*not so much as one of which is to the purpose?*” The thing requir'd (for thus “he goes on) is to produce an instance of the “word *δαίμονες* signifying malevolent, maleficent Beings, delighting or delighted in promoting wickedness amongst men.”¹

Here the author begins to display his dexterity. In the Sermon², *δαίμονες* are, indeed, called Beings “delighting, or *seeming*, at least, “delighted, in the indulgence, &c.” Our author's omission of the qualifying term cannot be look'd upon as a fault of the press. It is omitted a second time, in this same page; and also in pages 19, 27, 36, 38 of the *Review*. If he *cou'd not* distinguish between real

¹ Review, p. 16.

² p. 10.

and seeming delight, his *discernment* must be admir'd; if he *wou'd not*, his *sincerity*.

III.

To the description of *δαίμονες* abovemention'd he immediately subjoineth this piece of instruction — *viz.* “ For this sense of *δαίμονες* “ are cited *Plutarch, Porphyry, Jamblichus*”; and then politely adds — “ all good writers, “ but too modern by much for the thing to “ be prov'd.”¹ His own experience and conviction, undoubtedly, drew this courtesy from him; and the peculiar beauties of his style afford incontestable proof of his acquaintance with good writers. Well: but “ *they* “ (*Plutarch, &c.* as above) *are too modern by “ much for the thing to be prov'd.*” A general assertion, you find, is the author's happy instrument of refuting, what he is unwilling to admit. But, before the testimony of those, and of other writers, (mention'd also in the Sermon) who flourish'd after the promulgation of the Gospel, he resigned to his arbitrary exception against it, the reader is intreated to hear the following pleas in behalf of its validity — The author of the *Review* is (it cannot, surely, be too much to be presum'd) so well acquainted with those “ good “ writers,” as to know, that they were heathens. He pretends not to deny, that *they* us'd the words *δαίμων* and *δαίμόνιον*, in the sense, which is maintain'd in the Sermon. “ 'Tis not deny'd, say'th he², that *after* the

¹ Review, p. 16.

² Review, *ibid.*

“New Testament Times, that Word (*δαίμων*)
 “was us’d in an ill Sense; and the modern
 “*Platonists*, and Others, are full of such a
 “Notion.” Whence, then, can he imagin
 they deriv’d this use of the word? Certain-
 ly, he will not say, (tho’ hard it is to deter-
 min, what he will not say) from the preach-
 ers of the Gospel — *Lucian*, *Porphry*, *Julian*
 and *Libanius* were the eminent free-think-
 ers of their times; and claim’d, without
 doubt, the title of *fair and rational inqui-*
rers, even during their vehement opposition
 to the Gospel. To the credentials, that had
 been produc’d in proof of its divine original,
 they were not strangers. ¹ *Julian* expressly
 attributeth to our Savior the miraculous fact
 of dispossessing evil spirits; and *Lucian* sup-
 poseth that the same fact was commonly ac-
 knowledged. ² Our Savior had alledged it
 as an argument of His divine mission. To
 His disciples He had ³ promis’d ability to work
 the same miracle, in His name: and many
 of His messengers ⁴ reported to Him, that
 “even the devils were subject to them, thro’
 “His name.” Instances of miraculous pow-
 er, thus exercis’d, were not given in a corner:
 nor are they incidentally or ambiguously re-
 corded by the Evangelists; but propos’d as
 evidences of a divine commission, and ex-
 press’d in terms, which (according to the re-
 ceiv’d rules of grammar and criticism) im-

¹ See Serm. p. 1. ² *Matt.* xii. 28. and elsewhere. ³ *Mark*
 xvi. 17. and elsewhere. ⁴ *Luke* x. 17.

port, that the persons, in whose favour that power was exerted, had been possess'd by real, impure, spiritual Beings. When great stress, then, was also, in succeeding ages of Christianity, lay'd on the same fact, and frequent appeals made to it, in support of the Christian cause; is it credible, that enemies so watchful, sagacious and virulent, as *Lucian*, *Porphyry*, *Libanius* and *Julian* were, would have fail'd to ridicule and expose such appeals, had they been capable of supposing, that any degree of fiction took place in the report of the fact appeal'd to, and that it was founded only upon, and adapted to, a mistaken persuasion of the vulgar? Is it not much more credible, that they wou'd have triumph'd in the detection of the error, and urg'd the detected collusion of Christians in their pretences to *this* miracle, as an argument to depretiate the *rest*; which were reported, by the same authors, to have been wrought in confirmation of the same doctrine? From this defeat of Christians (had such a defeat been possible) might have been collected a plausible occasion, at least, of suggesting, that the Evangelical relation of *other* miracles, was not to be interpreted according to the usual acceptation of words, but to be regarded only as an artful accommodation of language to the groundless notions of the unthinking and illiterate. The *abilities* of the authors abovemention'd were, unquestionably, equal to the *discernment* of an imposture of this kind: nor can it be doubted,

doubted, that their *enmity* to Christianity wou'd have been sufficient incentive to reproach (had there been room to reproach) the preachers of that religion, with deluding their hearers, by appeals to pretended facts; and with abusing their credulity, by a design'd misapplication of words.

It may now, 'tis hoped, be safely concluded, that the testimony of the authors (even of *Jamblichus* too, tho' not distinguish'd by any direct cavils against Christianity) referr'd to in the Sermon, standeth in full force, and sufficiency to bear the stress, which is there lay'd upon it. The author of the *Review*, indeed, hath, in effect, confess'd it subversive of his scheme; and, therefor, thought fit to interpose an exception to it. Yet, had those very authors afforded *no* testimony, favorable to the usual acceptation of the words discuss'd, 'tis not improbable that the *Reviewer* (for, the *perverse* and the *paradox* generally prevail together) wou'd have call'd for *their* authority, with a degree of earnestness, equal to the contempt, with which he now regards it. Probable, at least, it is, that if they had *favoured* his cause, tho' in a much lower degree, than that, wherein they oppose it, he wou'd not only have applauded them, as "good writers", but as good *witnesses* too, in the present debate.

IV.

His next sentence, in the same page, appeareth thus — " But when the word (*δαιμων*)
" was

“ was never us’d for malevolent Beings, ’till
 “ such a Time at least; and then we find it us’d
 “ often in a certain Book, and no Intimation
 “ is given of its signifying in that Book *male-*
 “ *volent Beings, delighting in promoting Wick-*
 “ *edness*; what Necessity is there in that Book
 “ so to understand it?”

Here is a strange mixture of error and confusion; which must, perhaps, be imputed to the Panic, into which that horrid “pomp of references” had thrown him. In support of the description of *δαίμονες*, in the 1st Sermon, several Pagan authors are cited, by whose united testimony it is, in every part, supported. “But, say’th the *Reviewer*, “when the Word was never us’d for malevolent Beings, “’till such a Time at least; and then we find “it often us’d in a certain Book, &c.” What time? — the New Testament Time, that he talks of above? — And, will he not, then, allow that, in *that* time, a more full discovery of the spiritual world was made, than in any period antecedent to it? A more clear account of the Beings, call’d *δαίμονες* or *δαίμονια*, may justly be esteem’d a beneficial part of the discovery; seeing, their malignity, power and subtlety being made known, proper caution against their attempts is thereupon excited, and mankind more effectually induc’d to regard the creatures with abhorrence, which had some time usurp’d the honour of adoration, due only to the Creator. Nor shou’d it be any

matter of wonder, if they were more frequently spoken of in that time, wherein their nature and works were exposed to light; and a divine power display'd in the repression of their malicious rage.

But, what is this *certain* book, of which he talks again and again, in the same sentence? His language seems to intimate some obscure, contemptible composition, which this judg of "good writing" disdains to name.

V.

But, he thus proceeds — "Yes, but *Plato* "is produc'd as making the most pernicious "Delusions the favourite Employment of "*δαίμονες* ¹."

This report, surely, was not form'd, to support the title, which he assumes, and to realize his pretences to the *love of truth*! The passage of the Sermon, which the *Reviewer* representeth, in his way, is this — "When "the same authors (authors referr'd to in the "Sermon) make the most pernicious delusions "the favourite imployment of *δαίμονες*: when "they, ² &c." Yet, *Plato* alone is named by the *Reviewer*, as if no other had been mention'd with him.

This piece of ingenuity is immediately follow'd by a most apposite and rigorous interrogatory — "Do's *Plato* ever say so, *directly* "and in *Terms*?" In order to answer him,

¹ Review, p. 16, 17.

² P. 11.

in some measure, according to his wisdom, let me be permitted to ask — Do I appeal to *Plato*, as saying so, *directly and in terms*? or, have I lay'd a stress on *Plato's single authority*? The *Reviewer* may here give occasion to suspect, that he was serious, and directed by the simplicity of his heart, when he talk'd of “margins stuff'd with the pomp “of references;” and that, during his disturbance at the appearance, he fancy'd them design'd only for ostentation, amusement, or terror to elegant men, unaccustom'd to such hideous fights. An intelligent reader may be inclin'd to think them intended for another use, and suited to the subject under consideration. Of the Beings describ'd in the Sermon, the several authors, quoted in confirmation of the description, had only imperfect notices. It was necessary, then, to *collect* their sentiments, that all might jointly supply the light, which no one cou'd *separately* supply.

Before we leave that acute question of the Reviewer, may it not be properly inquir'd, why the testimony of *Plato* is call'd for *directly and in Terms*? Will not this cautious writer subscribe his assent to any proposition, the truth of which is not declar'd *directly and in Terms*? What refinements might be expected from him, should he undertake to comment upon any important article of religion, receiv'd in our church?

VI. But,

VI.

But, he go'th on immediately to this observation, in the Sermon †, — “ When they (the “ philosophers there spoken of) pronounce “ them (*δαίμονες*) the inventors and encouragers “ of such practices, as are most injurious both “ to individuals and to communities of men; “ they must, by necessary consequence from “ their own reasoning — be presum'd to look “ upon *δαίμονες*, as extremely evil.”

The Reviewer, in his transcript of this passage, hath quaintly distinguish'd — *presum'd* — by Italic characters. Cou'd the authors, there pointed out, have furnish'd him with any colour of argument, in defence of his own tenet; their sense wou'd, undoubtedly, have receiv'd a better air from his pen; and a *demonstration*, in his behalf, been rais'd out of such materials, as he will not, at present, allow sufficient to support even a *presumption* against him.

VII.

He asks again, ‡ “ Where do's *Plato* pronounce Demons to be the Inventors and “ Incouragers of pernicious Delusions?” And then he adds — “ Mr. *H.* refers to *Plato* in “ *Plutarch*, T. 2. p. † 36. Idem in *Phædro*, “ p. 240. Confer. idem de Rep. l. 2. p. 364. “ and 378 — 381 — 2. But in all these Places

† p. 11. ‡ P. 17. 3 not there, but p. 361.

“ there is not one Word about Demons encouraging pernicious Delusions.” How is this *prov'd*? Why, as usual — it is *affirm'd*. And, were the most peremptory conclusions the most pertinent too, who wou'd venture to gainsay him? But, his hardiess having already been expos'd, the justness of his present decision may reasonably be suspected; at least, 'til all the places referr'd to, be duly consider'd and compar'd. In the first, *Plato* (according to ¹ *Plutarch's* citation) forms a direct opposition between the characters of *ἑοὶ* and *δαίμονες*; to the former attributing what is *favorable* or *benign* and *singularly excellent*; to the latter, the *contrary*. *Plato*, then, herein justifieth some part of the description of *δαίμονες*, in the Sermon. And, had the *Reviewer* thought fit to have taken proper notice of *Xenocrates's* opinion, which *Plutarch* immediately subjoineth to that of *Plato*, the scholar might have given him a clearer idea of the master's sentiments, and supply'd some other distinguishing features, which belong to the Beings there spoken of. The expediency of paying attention to what was added, in *Plutarch*, to *Plato's* words, is plainly suggested in the very next sentence of the Sermon, which beginneth thus — “ and “ *Plutarch* supposeth, that several inquisitive “ heathens (whom he citeth as consentient “ with *Plato* herein) were justly led 2, &c.”

¹ — *ἑοὶς τὰ εὖ καὶ καλὰ, τὰ δ' ἀντίφωνα τῶν δαίμων ἀποδίδωσι.*

² P. 11.

The *Reviewer* might hence have learn'd to acknowledge, that I have not appeal'd to *Plato* immediately, in the first reference, but to *Plutarch's* representation of his thoughts. And, ¹ *Plutarch* having produc'd him as agreeing with several other philosophers in the notion of φαῦλοι δαίμονες, it might not have misbecame a *Reviewer*, to have consider'd, in this part of his *Review*, what those other philosophers had also say'd upon the Subject. In *Plutarch*, their accounts were properly plac'd together; and, thro' the assemblage, improve the light and strength of each other. But, our author having judg'd it more convenient for him to postpone the evidences of *Empedocles* and *Xenocrates*, I shall follow him in his own way, and proceed to

VIII.

The next reference, made immediately to *Plato*, in *Phædro*, p. 240. The words of the place declare a variety of evils, with most of which an immediate or present pleasure had been intermingled by some δαίμων ². The pleasure intermix'd hath the appearance of an allurements to those evils. The author, therefore, of it (some δαίμων) may justly be call'd the inventor or encourager, at least, of a pernicious delusion; if, thro' his proposal of a present pleasure, men might be induc'd to in-

¹ As cited in the Sermon, p. 11.

² Ἐστὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλα κακά· ἀλλὰ τις ἔμειξε δαίμων τῆς πλείστας ἐν τῷ παρωτίκῳ ἡδονῇ.

volve themselves in guilt. According to the use which ¹ *Clemens Alexandrinus* hath made of this passage of *Plato*, (and this philosopher might be, perhaps, as well understood by that Father, as by the *Reviewer*) the δαίμων, therein spoken of, was either ὁ θρυλλέμενος διάβολος, or some immediate vassal and agent of that ἄρχων τῶν δαιμόνων.

IX.

The next references to *Plato* are thus propos'd — “Confer. idem de Repub. l. 2. p. 364. “& p. 378 — 381 — 2.” Here the *Reviewer* should have attended to the manner, in which these references are made. *Plato* is not therein cited, as offering *direct*, *indubitable* evidence, in regard to the present subject of debate; but, a *collation* of him with the other authors, referr'd to at the same time, is recommended to the reader. And, with what pertinence this office was recommended, a brief survey of the passages will evince.

In the first, which occurreth l. 2. de Rep. p. 364. the αἰγύς and μάστιγες are charg'd with attempting to delude, not only some few individuals, but whole states, into a persuasion, that they were inabl'd by the θεοί, (whose aid they pretended to ingage, by ἐπαδαί, θυσίαι, ἐπαγωγαί τινες) to clear men from the dangerous consequences of any wrongs, whereof

¹ *Strom. l. 5. p. 701, & seq. Edit. Oxon.*

² *Serm. p. 11.*

they had been guilty. That the φαῦλοι or πονηροὶ δαίμονες might incourage their votaries, to make an attempt of this pernicious nature, ¹ *Porphyry* and ² *Jamblicus* will authorise us to maintain. And those Beings, as the ³ former also observeth, βέλον³ εἶναι θεοί, — and according to the latter — ὑποκρίνον³ τὴν τῶν θεῶν παρεσίαν. It may still, then, seem probable, that by θεοί, in this passage of *Plato*, δαίμονες are to be understood; especially seeing this use of θεοί is say'd by *Proclus* (no incompetent judg of *Plato's* language) to obtain in many places of that author.

X.

In the next passage, extant p. 378, are mention'd the extreme injustice, unnatural cruelty, and discord amongst the θεοί, continu'd either by insidious practices or by open violence. The imputation, indeed, of such enormities to the θεοί is there condemn'd; as capable of producing ill impressions on the minds of the young especially, and propagating wrong notions of the Beings, commonly distinguish'd by that name. But, supposing δαίμονες to be here intended by it, the transactions will be, in some degree, suitable (as those were, which the former passage records) to *such* agents; and the narration found to contain some footsteps of truth. Nor is this supposition groundless. *Plutarch*, having mention'd facts, which

¹ *de abst.* l. 2. sect. 41 & seq.

² *de myst.* Sect. iv. c. 7.

³ *loco cit.*

resemble

resemble these, ¹ say'th that they were more properly attributed to δαίμονες, than either to θεοί, or to ἄνθρωποι: and citeth *Plato*, *Pythagoras*, *Xenocrates*, and *Chrysippus*, as concurring in the same opinion. The opinion seemeth to have been founded upon a just persuasion, that, in the facts, to which it relateth, were imply'd such guilt and suffering, as cou'd not be ascribed to θεοί: and such power, as belongeth not to human nature. *Plato*, then, having (according to *Plutarch*) attributed the like facts to δαίμονες, may, not improbably, be thought to have intended the same Beings, in this passage; where he mentions the stories, concerning the various dissensions and wars of θεοί, and pronounceth them improperly apply'd to the Beings, which θεοί was suppos'd to denote.

XI.

In pages 381 — 2 of *Plato*, it is inquir'd, whether the θεοί may, in some cases, be esteem'd ἐξαπατῶντες ἢ γοητεύοντες? And, in the answer, (*viz.* Ι Σ Ω Σ) it is imply'd, that the acts, specify'd in the inquiry, had been, or might, without absurdity, be attributed to them. But the answer implyeth not only, what is not absurd, but also what is strictly true, provided δαίμονες be here likewise comprehended in the term θεοί. By those (according to *Porphyry* ²) ἡ πᾶσα γοητεία ἐκτελεῖται

¹ T. 2. p. 360.

² *de abst.* l. 2. sect. 41, 42. compare *Jamblich. & Liban.* as cited in *Serm.* p. 11.

πλήρεις ᾧ πάσης φαντασίας ἔτοι, καὶ ἐπαίηται
 ἱκανοὶ διὰ τὴν τετραγώνιαν — τὸ ᾧ ψεύδῃ τέτοις
 οἰκεῖον. But the ⁱ Reviewer observes, that
 “ *Plato* condemns *Homer*, and other Poets,
 “ for such figments, and adds, Πάντη ἄρα
 “ ἀψώδεις τὸ δαιμόνιον τε καὶ τὸ θεῖον.” Elated
 with this sentence, he proceeds, after a short
 intermission, to ask, “ Is it not a very strong
 “ argument to prove that *Plato* thought *De-*
 “ *mons* Encouragers of *Frauds* and *Delusions*,
 “ that he expressly says, *The nature of Gods*
 “ and *Demons* is altogether free from *Delu-*
 “ *sions* ? ”

The sentence, Πάντη ἄρα, &c. seemeth to
 be a conclusion, design'd to rectify mistakes,
 in the preceding debate. And, as no express
 mention had before been made of δαίμονες,
 or the δαιμόνιον γένος, it appeareth, that they
 were rightly suppos'd to be comprehended in
 the term θεοὶ, during the course of the dis-
 pute ; seeing they make part of the subject, in
 the conclusion. Well : but is not the con-
 clusion directly contrary to the notion of δαί-
 μονες, maintain'd in the Sermon ? No : in the
 Sermon it is prov'd, that δαίμονες representeth
 good, as well as evil spirits : of the former
 this conclusion is to be understood ; whil'st
 the latter are, 'tis probable, meant by θεοὶ,
 where it is intimated, that ἐξαπάτη and γοη-
 τεία were not thought inconsistent with their
 nature.

XII.

But, after Πάντη ἀγα ἀψευδες, &c. in the *Review*, the next sentence we read is this, — “Mr. H. was so far conscious of this, that he has put this Note immediately after the References before mention’d, viz. “Where indeed, HE (*Plato*) useth the Word Θεοὶ; yet δαίμονες, ’tis PROBABLE, are to be understood by it:” Why so? FOR, thus *Proclus* says, “that *Plato*, in many places, calls “*Demons, Gods*: Ergo, in this Place.” Thus can the *Reviewer* rally or reason, you see, with equal felicity. Conscious of this — what? — “that in all these places, (as he is pleas’d to say) there is not one Word about *Demons* “*encouraging pernicious Delusions?*” Such a consciousness might, ’tis true, result from the perusal of those places, by a person of our *Reviewer*’s skill and penetration. In me, who pretend not to the like abilities, they produc’d a different persuasion. And, not the note only, whereof the *Reviewer* speaks, but each reference may shew, that I was conscious of what I had read, and of what I wrote: conscious, that I had not attempted to abuse my reader, ² by *diverting his attention from clear to contestable evidence*, — that I had not made an indiscriminate claim to *Plato*’s suffrage; but only in *one* instance ap-

¹ P. 17. See Serm. p. 11.

² See *Review*, p. 16, 17. compar’d with Remark V.

appeal'd immediately to him; in *another*, upon *Plutarch's* report; and, in regard to all the other references, wherein his name occurs, suggested the expediency of *comparing* the tenor of his language with that of *Plutarch*, of *Porphry*, of *Jamblichus* and of *Libanius*; all cited at the same time, with the same design. I was also conscious, that these authors did not only place the tenet, in support of which they are quoted, above all danger of just exception; but that they might likewise, upon comparison with the three last passages of *Plato*, afford some ground of probability, that these, or some of these, *Proclus* had in view, when he observ'd, that *Plato*, in many places, apply'd to *δαίμονες* the appellation of *θεοί*. To one conscious of these several points, it was needless, as well as unbecoming and absurd, first to form conjectural premises, and then press an illative particle to introduce a peremptory conclusion.

XIII.

From *Plato* the author of the *Review* † advanceth to *Empedocles*; and asketh, “How
“does it hence appear (from *Empedocles's*
“verses, I suppose) that *Demons* were con-
“ceiv'd by *Empedocles* to be malevolent Be-
“ings delighting or delighted (thus is he
“pleas'd with repeating his own Absurdity)
“in promoting wickedness? He imagin'd, in-

† Review, p. 19. and again p. 37.

“ deed, that if *Demons* were guilty of any
 “ crimes, they were punish’d by strange re-
 “ volutions ’till they were purify’d; and then
 “ they were restor’d to their own natural Re-
 “ gion and Order. But what is this to ma-
 “ levolent, maleficent Beings, promoting Mi-
 “ sery among men?” And — “ what is all
 “ this to evil Demons or Devils wand’ring
 “ thro’ the Air, about Sea and Land, and
 “ striving with Assiduity and Fierceness to
 “ delude Men into Ruin, and actually making
 “ some of the Species their Prey?

Here the Reviewer wou’d insinuate, (ac-
 cording to his usual ingenuity) that the de-
 scription of δαίμονες, in the Sermon, was
 founded on *Empedocles*’s authority alone: and
 then his accumulated, severe demands prove,
 (as clearly as any reasonable man can expect
 him to prove) that the description can receive
 no confirmation from the verses of that phi-
 losopher. Yet, concerning their import
Plutarch seemeth to have entertain’d a diffe-
 rent opinion. In one of the pages, wherein
 he hath preserv’d them, an express distincti-
 on, between χρηστοὶ and φαῦλοι δαίμονες, had
 been premis’d. And, after *Plato*’s, *Xeno-
 crates*’s and *Hesiod*’s accounts of those Be-
 ings, it is added, Εμπεδοκλῆς ὃ καὶ δίκας φησὶ
 διδόναι τὰς δαίμονας ὧν ἑξαμάργωσι καὶ πλημμελή-
 σωσι —

Αἰθέριον μὲν γὰρ σφε μὲν, &c. as in the Sermon¹? Here they are represented as rejected with detestation, in all parts of the visible world; and regarded as the objects of universal horror. And, will not this representation contribute, in some degree, to evince their *malevolence* and *maleficence*? Ill-fated Beings, surely, if every where treated with extreme abhorrence; whilst free from the guilt of all πλημμελήματα, which might argue their malignity towards man, or insolence towards the Deity! But, the *Reviewer* (led by his exuberant benevolence to perpetual solicitude about their welfare and credit)² tells you from *Plutarch*, that “when Demons “*sinn’d*, they underwent severe Punishments, “toss’d from the Air to the Sea, from Sea to “Earth, from Earth to the Sun, from the Sun “to the Air, till being thus punish’d and “purify’d, they again obtain their natural “Region and Order.” It is readily allow’d, that a mistaken notion, concerning the duration of their punishment and final allotment, might easily be entertain’d by Pagan philosophers. But, besides the words, wherein the opinion, about their restoration to their natural order, is express’d, those also, which immediately follow in *Plutarch*, might have deserv’d the consideration of the *Reviewer*. Thus *Plutarch* then proceeds³ — Τῶν δὲ καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀδελφὰ λέγεσθαι φασὶ περὶ Τυφῶν, ὡς δεινὰ μὲν

¹ P. 12, and about the close of this remark.

² Review, p. 37. and before, in p. 19.

³ P. 361.

ὑπὸ φθόνῳ καὶ δυσμυθείας ἐργάσατο· καὶ πάντα
 πρῶτα ταρσίζας, ἐνέπλησε κακῶν γῆν ὅμῃ τε
 πᾶσαν καὶ θάλασσαν, εἶτα δίκην ἔδωκεν — i. e. *It*
is say'd, that there are relations concerning
Typhon, which bear a very near resemblance
to these and the like (viz. what had been just
before produc'd, in the verses of Empedocles)
importing, that he, thro' envy and malignity,
committed horrible crimes; and that, having
caus'd a general perturbation, he at the same
time fill'd both the whole earth and sea with
calamities, and afterwards was punish'd.
 Shou'd the *Reviewer* be here tempted (as he
 is accusom'd) shrewdly to inquire, “How
 “does it hence appear, that Demons were
 “conceiv'd by *Empedocles* to be malevolent,
 “maleficent Beings, delighting in promoting
 “wickedness, or in promoting Misery among
 “Men? —” I must take leave to answer,
 that, in *Plutarch's* opinion, it doth hence
 appear, that *Empedocles's* description import-
 eth such a notion of them; seing he say' th,
 in the passage already cited, that between this
 description, and the relations concerning *Ty-*
phon, there is a very near resemblance. Well:
 but what are the reports about *Typhon* to the
 purpose? must harmless δαίμονες be traduc'd,
 because that monster hath met with his de-
 served character? Here I must again take
 leave to interpose the judgment of *Plutarch*,
 in order to ward off the expostulations of
 the *Reviewer*; and to produce his words † —

† Referr'd to in Remark X.

Βέλτιον — οἱ τὰ πρὸ τὸν Τυφῶνα — ἰσορρομῶν
 μήτε θεῶν παθήματα μήτε ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ δαι-
 μόνων μεγάλων, εἶναι νομίζοντες, ὡς καὶ Πλάτων
 καὶ Πυθαγόρας καὶ Ξενοκράτης καὶ Χρύσιππος, ἐπό-
 μθοι τὰς πάσαις θεολόγας, ἐρρωμενεστέρας μὲν ἀν-
 θρώπων γεγονέναι λέγουσι, κ. τ. λ. ² i. e. *The*
opinion of those deserveth preference, who,
thinking that the things, recorded of Typhon,
imply such passions and incidents, as agree not
either to gods or men, but to great demons,
as Plato, and Pythagoras, and Xenocrates, and
Chrysippus thought, assenting to antient di-
viners, say that they (demons) are more power-
ful than men, &c.

What the things were, which the accounts
 of *Typhon* contain'd, page the 22^d will shew;
 and, at the same time, so far confirm what
 is said of δαίμονες in the Sermon, as to leave
 nothing more to be supply'd, than what may
 be easily collected from other authors, quoted
 in the same place.

Before we leave the verses of *Empedocles*,
 it may be observ'd, that the *Reviewer* affects

² *Plutarch*, T. 2. p. 360. where these words immediately
 follow — καὶ πολλῇ τῇ δυνάμει τὴν φύσιν ὑπερφέρουσιν ἡμῶν, τὰ
 δὲ θεῶν οὐκ ἀμύνει, ἀλλὰ ἀπολαύοντες ἔχουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχῆς φύσιν
 καὶ σώματος αἰσθησὶν ἐν συνειληκῶς, ἡδονῇ δεχομένη καὶ πόσιν καὶ
 ἴσα ταύταις ἐσθλότητα ταῖς μεταβολαῖς πάσῃ, τὰς μὲν μάλλον,
 τὰς δὲ ἥτιον ἐπιταράττει. These are here added for the sake of
 proposing a reformation of them. Instead then, of — αἰσθησὶν
 ἐν συν — it might be better to read — αἰσθησὶν ἐν συν — In-
 stead of — δεχομένη — to read — δεχομένη. — Instead of —
 ἐπιταράττει — to read — ἐπιταράττειν. The *Reviewer*, perhaps,
 may find the passage cited by an antient Christian writer, and
 then pretend, that he thence produc'd the true reading of it.

to cite them (not from *Plutarch*, p. 361. where they first occur, but) from *Plutarch*, p. 830. And, proving that he now had pretty well conquer'd the fastidium or fright, which a "pomp of references" had formerly rais'd, he grow'th familiar with them; and bravely thus presenteth the reader with the following lines †.

Αἰθέριον μὲν γὰρ σφε μένῳ πόνῳδε διώκει.
 Πόνῳ δ' ἐς χθονὸς ἔδρας ἀπέπλυνσε· γαῖα δ' ἐς
 αὐγὰς
 Ἡελίς ἀκάμανῳ· ὃ δ' αἰθέρῳ ἔμβαλε δίναις.
 Ἀλλῳ δ' ἐξ ἄλλας δέχεται συγέσσι δὲ πάντες.

and adds, "Thus *Plutarch* gives us these "Lines in his Treatise *De vitando ære alieno*, p. 830." Do's he so? Alas! these same references have drawn a sort of vengeance upon our author; and, in aggravation of it, have made his own "eyes and hands" the instruments of exposing the rashness of his pretences to familiarity with them. In the 830th and 831st pages of *Plutarch*, the lines above cited, appear exactly thus—

Αἰθέριον μὲν γὰρ σφε μένῳ πόνῳδε διώκει.
 Πόνῳ δ' ἐς χθονὸς ἔδρας ἀνέπλυνσε· γαῖα δ' ἐς
 αὐγὰς
 Ἡελίς ἀκάμανῳ, ὃ δ' αἰθέρῳ ἔμβαλε δίναις.

Thus ends p. 830. and then immediately, in p. 831. follow, ἄλλον δ' ἐξ ἄλλας δέχεται πικ-

† Review, p. 37.

της ἢ κ. τ. λ. in *Plutarch's* plain prose. About false stops and false accents I propose no question. But, why did he tell his reader, "Thus (or as he hath exhibited them) *Plutarch* gives us these Lines in his Treatise" &c. whereas, in *Plutarch* we read — Πόντος ὃ χθονὸς ἔδρας ἀνέπλυνε — in the *Reviewer's* copy — Πόντος δ' ἐς χθονὸς ἔδρας ἀπέπλυνε — in *Plutarch* — αἰθέρῳ ἑμβαλεῖ δύναις — is follow'd by — ἄλλων δ' ἐξ ἄλλας δεχέσθαι τοκιστῆς ἢ κ. τ. λ. in the *Reviewer's* copy — by

ἄλλῳ δ' ἐξ ἄλλας δεχέσθαι συγέσθαι ὃ πάντες.

If it can, after all, be suppos'd, that he really transcrib'd those verses from p. 830 of *Plutarch*; yet, might it still seem strange, (cou'd any thing be strange, in the conduct of such a writer) that the clause, which immediately precedeth them, shou'd be pass'd by, without the notice of a *Reviewer*. Therein are mention'd οἱ θεήλατοι ἢ ἔρανοπέλεις ἐκείνοι & Εμπεδοκλέους δαίμονες. The epithets are remarkable; and might have reminded our author of passages in a *certain* book, relating to certain Beings, vulgarly call'd fall'n angels. Amongst these must the δαίμονες and δαιμόνια of the New Testament be left, in defiance of all his attempts to rescue them. And, whether he will acknowledg it or not, the characters of *malevolence* and *maleficence* stand fix'd indelibly upon the Beings so call'd, in profane as well as sacred authors.

XIV.

Xenocrates is the only witness, whose evidence remaineth undefended. And the passage, in which it is express'd, is thus produc'd by the *Reviewer* — ¹ δυσρόπας καὶ Κυθρωπας, αἱ χαίρῃσι τοῖς τοῖς, (viz. writes the *Reviewer*) ἡμερῶν ἀποφράδας καὶ τῶν ἑορτῶν ὅσαι πληγὰς τινὰς, ἢ κοπετὰς, ἢ νησεῖας, ἢ δυσφημίας, ἢ αἰχρολογίαν ἔχουσιν) καὶ τυγχάνεσαι πρὸς ἕθεν ἄλλο χεῖρον τρέπον). The reader will be easily led, by this admirable grammatical structure of the words, to suspect, that the *Reviewer* must here have meddled with language, of which he had only a slender knowledg. In *Plutarch* ² we read thus — Ο ὦ Ξενοκράτης καὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὰς ἀποφράδας καὶ τῶν ἑορτῶν ὅσαι πληγὰς τινὰς, ἢ κοπετὰς, ἢ νησεῖας, ἢ δυσφημίας, ἢ αἰχρολογίαν ἔχουσιν, ἕτε θεῶν τιμαῖς ἕτε δαιμόνων οἶεται προσήκειν χρηστῶν· ἀλλὰ εἶναι φύσεις ἐν τῇ παρτίᾳ μεγάλας μὲν καὶ ἰσχυράς, δυσρόπας ὅ καὶ Κυθρωπας, αἱ χαίρῃσι τοῖς τοῖς, καὶ τυγχάνεσαι πρὸς ἕθεν ἄλλο χεῖρον τρέπον). Herein are recounted several hurtful, infamous practices, which *Xenocrates* judg'd to be unsuitable methods of honouring either the deities or good demons; and also declar'd to be the delight of those vast, powerful, malign and gloomy Beings, (call'd above φαῦλοι δαίμονες) which inhabit the air. But, the *Reviewer* thus gently representeth the sense of the place —

¹ Review, p. 36.² De Is. & Os. p. 361.

“ *Xenocrates* indeed talk’d of *gloomy, morose*
 “ Demons that rejoice in such days, in which
 “ Men smote their Breasts, mourned, and
 “ fasted; and if they *have but these*, they
 “ turn to *nothing worse*.” — *have but these* —
 what must become, then, of *δυσφημίαι* and
αἰχρολογία? why were they suppress’d in the
Reviewer’s account? The phrases — *have*
but these — and — *nothing worse* — he hath
 distinguish’d by Italics; as if he thought his
 demons thereby sufficiently vindicated. But,
 what *worse* wou’d the *Reviewer* have? Is
 there not sufficient *moral malignity* (as he
 calls it) here pointed out, when the tenor of
 the whole passage is consider’d, and compar’d
 with another of the same purport, in *Plu-*
*tarch*², referr’d to likewise in the Sermon?
 Surely, even the *Reviewer* must, upon se-
 cond thoughts, be inclin’d to acknowledg,
 that a delight in receiving such tokens of ve-
 neration from deluded mortals, as consisted in
 wounding their bodies, in sinister and ob-
 scene expressions, may argue a disposition di-
 rectly contrary to (permit me thus far to imi-
 tate, for the sake of opposing, him) *moral*
benignity. He seemeth conscious, it must be
 own’d, that this single testimony is intirely

¹ Review, p. 36, 37.

² De def. orac. p. 417. ἱερτὰς δὲ καὶ θυσίας, ὥσπερ ἡμέρας δάπ-
 φρεῖδας καὶ σκυθρωπάς, ἐν αἷς ὡμοφαγίαι καὶ ἀλγασσασμοί, νηστιαί τε
 καὶ κοπιτοί, πολλαχῇ δὲ πάλιν αἰχρολογίαι πρὸς ἱεροῖς, μανίαι τε
 ἄλλαι ὁρνήμεναι ἐν ψαύχενι σιῶ κλονῶ, θεῶν μὲν ἑδερὶ, δαιμόνων
 δὲ φάων δάπτροπῆς ἕνεκα φήσαιμ’ ἂν τελευτῶν μελίχια καὶ ὠδύ-
 μύθια· κ. τ. λ.

sufficient to expose all his cavils: and say'th, (in despair, as it were, of bringing off his clients) "Take this Hypothesis — take this, "I say, and still, I ask, what Evidence have "you for *morally malignant* Beings among "the antients?" Then he immediately and happily thus answereth himself, "*Xenocrates*, "who was himself a dark, gloomy Fellow." Such is the consequence of fixing a bad character on our author's "*good demons, departed "souls, vanities, nothings;*" — the true *English*, in that noble *Thesaurus*, whereby he is govern'd, for *δαίμονες* or *δαίμόνια*! *Xenocrates* was, unquestionably, a sorry, impertinent fellow — For, who, except such a fellow, wou'd have talk'd in that manner against those Beings, before he knew, what pleas wou'd be offer'd in their behalf, by their strenuous patrons in succeeding ages? And, a *dark* fellow too he was, — 'tis plain enough — his language was *Greek*. Besides, *Laertius* seems to be call'd upon to prove, that he deserv'd an ill-name. For, thus ends the *Review, Erratum*, p. 37. for *αυθροπῶς*, *Laertius* read *αυθροπῶς*, vid. *Laertius*. Our author must here be advis'd to consider what was say'd above †, concerning references to authors. Exactness in making them may be reasonably expected from all writers; and, from those of his own class, is indispensably requir'd, in order to lessen, in some degree,

† Remark 1.

the drudgery of pursuing them. He had in view, it may be suppos'd, *Laert.* l. 4. segm. 6. where *Xenocrates* is call'd *Σεινὸς καὶ Κυβερνῆς*. What *conclusions* the *Reviewer* will allow to be drawn from the *countenance*, it may not be easy to say. Yet, the gravity and austerity, which appear'd in *Xenocrates*, can hardly be thought sufficient to invalidate his authority; especially, when the excellent character, by which he is distinguish'd in *Laertius*,¹ and other authors, (cited by the commentators) shall have been duly consider'd.

XV.

The authorities cited in the Sermon, in support of the usual interpretation of *δαίμων* and *δαίμονιον*, may be now thought abundantly vindicated from the cavils and general negatives of the *Reviewer*. Yet still must not the reader be deny'd the diversion of beholding our author triumph, as it were, in his own defeat. No sooner had *Xenocrates* been dismiss'd, than he thus courageously proceedeth² — “ But what *Evidence* is there for even
“ such a Notion? — (as that philosopher entertain'd of *δαίμονες*, I suppose, he means)
“ In the first Place, the whole Hypothesis is
“ mere Fiction. In the second Place, there
“ was no Notion of such *malevolent* Beings as
“ delighted in *promoting wickedness*. And
“ thirdly, not a word of their possessing Men,

¹ Loco cit. & segm. seq.² Review p. 38.

“ and

“and inflicting Misery upon them, or wading thro’ the Air, and Earth and Sea, for any such Purpose.”

See, with what matchless prowess he surmount all difficulties, and lay his opponents prostrate, at every step he takes! what wonderful execution may be done with a stile, directed by “eyes and hands”, like his? And, who will dare to resist any arguments of this formidable tenor? For my part, I was inclin’d to be thankful to him, for suspending his notice of me, whil’st all his other adversaries feel the heavy effects of his ability, thro’ a course of many pages—which they, perhaps, may be tempted to call one tedious parenthesis.

But, ’tis vain to expect any lasting security, from the assaults of so resolute an enemy. In the 64th page he returns to take a parting stroke: and, sensible wherein his main strength lyeth, he very rhetorically pronounceth his adversaries guilty of making “such reflexions as are unworthy of Men, and most unworthy of Preachers of the Gospel.” How doth he *prove* his charge? with much ease—he boldly *pronounceth* it. But, hath he not confirm’d it by adding, that the “Gospel teacheth a Charity, that *thinketh no Evil, and hopeth all things.*” A flagrant violation of that charity, undoubtedly, which the Gospel injoineth, to expose the attempts, that are made to pervert it’s language, and subject it to the capricious humour of every enemy

enemy to its purity! But, thus antiscripturists, not contented with invading historical parts of the sacred volume, seem resolv'd to extend their violence even to the divine rules of practice, by crude, perverse applications.

Mr. *Twells's* Answer to the *Enquirer*, &c. and the *Essay* in vindication of the literal sense &c. (which I have read with pleasure) seem no otherwise obnoxious to the *Reviewer's* calumny, than as they contain confutations of his tenet. Of the reflexion, in the Sermon, wherewith he is offended, enough hath been say'd in the Preface. His rage is now kindl'd: and, as it's bounds may not be easily fix'd, forbearance, in this case, becometh charity to him. I wou'd only, therefor, improve the charity, with an expression of hope, that (shou'd his *hands* be again imploy'd upon the subject) he may be able to shew the conquest of his transports, by publishing, instead of a *second Review* of the like tenor, a retractation of the *first*.

F I N I S.

[31]

enemy to his purity! But, thus antipathetic
 still, not contented with invading historical
 parts of the sacred volume, seem resolv'd to
 extend their violence even to the divine rules
 of piety, by crude, perverted applications.
 This is the Answer to the Enquirer, &c.
 and the Essay in vindication of the literal
 sense of (which I have read with pleasure)
 seems to contain objections to the Re-
 verend's calumny, than as they contain con-
 siderations of his text. Of the reflection, in
 the Sermon, wherewith he is offended, e-
 ven if it has been say'd in the Preface. His
 rage is now kindl'd; and, as it's bounds may
 not be easily fix'd, forbearance, in this case,
 becometh charity to him, I would only
 mention, improve the charity, with an ex-
 pression of hope, that (should his words be
 apply'd upon the subject) he may be
 able to shew the conduct of his transports;
 by unfolding, instead of a second Review of
 the like tenor, a rectification of the first.

F I W I S

